

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 22, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 33, 46 and 54-62, but indicated claims 20, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 44, 45 and 47-53 as allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowed subject matter. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have amended claims 33, 46, 54-57 and 62. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

#### 1. Election/Restriction

While Applicants do not choose to file a petition challenging the restriction and election of species requirement at this time, Applicants assert that such requirement was improper and reserve the right to later challenge the requirement if necessary.

#### 2. Objections

Part four of the Office Action indicates that the word "includes" is mistyped. Applicants thank the examiner for this indication, however, a review of Applicants' previously submitted amendment suggests that the word "includes" appears to be properly used. If the Examiner still believes that the word has been improperly used or improperly spelled, Applicants request that the Examiner phone the undersigned to address any such remaining issues.

#### 3. Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected claims 33 and 55-62 suggesting that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims because of the use of the term "thermosettable material". Without acquiescing in this suggestion or rejection, Applicants have changed the language of the rejected claims

to remove the term “thermosettable material” and/or otherwise address and overcome the asserted rejections.

The Office Action rejected claim 54 and 62 suggesting that the specification does not support the terms “acrylate” or “acetate”. Without acquiescing in these rejections, Applicants have amended these claims to overcome the rejections.

The Office Action rejected claim 46 suggesting that the specification is not enabling for application by a combination of an individual and a machine. Without acquiescing in this rejection, Applicants have amended this claim to overcome the rejection.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather, Applicants intend to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the lack of teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.


### CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Dated: 9 January, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Chapple  
Registration No. 33,867  
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC  
29 W. Lawrence Street  
Suite 210  
Pontiac, MI 48342  
(248) 292-2920  
Customer No. 25215